



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Eight of the plays are dated with satisfactory precision by ancient testimony. The remaining plays are dated approximately from external evidence, such as the comedies of Aristophanes, and from internal evidence, such as metrical and linguistic technique and references to contemporary affairs. The attempts made to date certain plays from supposed references to political affairs are numerous. Greek history has been searched for political situations which would seem likely to call forth the views advocated in the plays. Conclusions reached in this way must always be accepted with great caution, for it is more than likely that many items of Greek politics have not been recorded.

Moreover, the motive which led the poet to treat a certain theme at a particular time cannot be discerned with certainty; the motive may have been political, but it may also have been poetical, or something not at all suspected. The poet may have been influenced by some knowledge of his competitors' themes at the same dramatic contest.

The poet's environment may have had a good deal to do with the views advocated. Thus his removal from the scene of civil war and party strife to Macedonia seems to account for the religious calm of his last days, as shown in the *Bacchae* and *Iphigenia in Aulide*. It is unnatural to suppose any change of religious views, much less a recantation.

Neither are such matters as metrical and literary technique sure criteria for judgment as to the date of a play, except within large limits. These and other criteria afford a basis for a good guess, and, with the data available, that is the best that one can do in several instances.

C. F. CASTLE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Ancient Legends of Roman History. By ETTORE PAIS. Translated by MARIO E. COSENZA. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1905. Pp. xiv + 336. \$4 net.

The thirteen chapters and six excursus of this work approximately reproduce the lectures of Professor Pais before the Lowell Institute and various universities in the winter of 1904-5. The matter treated ranges from critical method and the origins of Rome to the topography of the Via Nova. Among the noteworthy topics are "Acca Larentia," "Tarpeia," "Servius Tullius," "Etruscan Supremacy," "Horatii," "Fabii," "Lucretia," "Virginia," "Spurius Maelius," "Niger Lapis," "Square Palatine," "Caelius Vibenna," etc.

The illustrations are numerous and good. The book does credit to the publishers, though misprints like "Viscus Jugarius" p. 17; "Fordilicia" p. 58; "nevertheless," p. 80 "Mastarna" and "Macstarna" pp. 133, 134; "Innus" and "Inus" p. 294; "Hypoknemiadai Locrians," p. 281, etc. are too numerous. There are also false citations: cf. p. 282, n. 34; p. 287, n. 48; p. 288, n. 55; p. 297, n. 16, etc.

The translation is not only awkward, but is often obscure, or even unintelligible. This is the more to be regretted as almost every theme treated is or has been

the subject of a controversy so minute that no place remains for careless and general statements about them from even the most distinguished authority. On the question whether Professor Pais is such an authority scholars may differ, but there can be no question that he or his translator asserts that authority too boldly. Facts, proofs, assertions, and guesses follow each other in such rapid succession that the reader may well be pardoned if he sometimes confuses them, a fault he will share with the author, who on more than one occasion has allowed the hypothesis of one page to grow into an assertion on a later page. The author's personal references (pp. 247-58) to his quarrel with the scholars of the Italian school seem to me out of place in a book intended for American readers. Still more uncalled for is his eulogy of America on p. 223.

Professor Pais is easily chief skeptic among Roman historians. Already in his *Storia di Roma* (1898-99) he refused credence to all Roman tradition down to and including the Decemvirate. This view has been well combated or even, in the opinion of many conservative scholars, entirely disproved by the criticisms of Greenidge (*Historical Review*, 1905, pp. 4 ff.), Goudy (*Juridical Review* XVII [1905]. 2), and others. Yet in this new work Pais, without considering the objections which have been urged, proceeds in his destruction of Roman history even down to the invasion by Pyrrhus, and indeed seems to have doubts about much that follows. This position is too extreme to merit detailed criticism; but even worse is his system of proof. All similar characters and episodes, many even where the similarity is mostly imaginary, are identified. So (p. 185) Virginia = Lucretia = a maid of Ardea, while all are borrowed from the story of Helen of Sparta; on p. 105, Tarpeius = Tarquinius, etc. The only proof offered for the last is the alleged etymological identity of the words. Though Pais gives this view as if original, it was ancient in 1858, when Krahner, in *Die Sage von der Tarpeia*, doubtfully cited some old authorities for it. In recent years Pais seems the only one who has overlooked the Etruscan origin of Tarquinius, Tarquinii, etc., and tried to explain them by Oscan-Latin analogies.

On p. 6 the *Annales Maximi* are condemned as of late date and filled with anecdotes and religious tales. This is also an old view, often advanced but abundantly refuted; cf. Cichorius in Pauly-Wissowa, s. v.

Perhaps Pais' worst fault is his lack of system and accuracy in his use of sources. On p. 105 he says: "We cannot establish whether or not the story that Tarpeia was killed by Tatius because she would not divulge the secrets of Romulus, dates from very ancient sources." As the only authority is the Chronograph a. 354 A. D., I consider the statement hardly honest. Similar instances are found. Thus Laurentius Lydus is several times considered a good source, while Licinius Macer is always, and the *Annales Maximi* are almost always, bad.

Often wonderful statements occur for which no citation is given, or the one given does not cover the statement; cf. p. 29, the Protagorean code of Thuri; p. 48, Cermalus, where Romulus was born; p. 56, a sapling of the *ficus Ruminalis*, transplanted to the Comitium in the middle of the fourth century; p. 100,

Polyaenus, who drew from good sources; p. 200, Aeneas, an ancient Latin god; p. 212, the knife with which C. Servilius slew Sp. Maelius; p. 235, sepulcher of the Horatii (should be Horatia), etc.

Perhaps the gem of all is on p. 226: "The Bull of the Forum Boarium was a Greek *word* from Aegina and *was* originally connected with Greek myths." The *bull* seems to me rather Irish. Of course we can correct *word* to *work* for which Pliny xxxiv. 10 is proof, but for the rest there is no authority.

In spite of all this the book is of interest and value to the investigator, though it must be used with extreme care. Professor Pais has a knowledge of the writers and traditions of Roman history which is second to none. Also his acute suggestions, combinations, or theories will often throw light on difficult points, even where we cannot accept his conclusions.

HENRY A. SANDERS

ANN ARBOR

The Campaign of Plataea. By HENRY BURT WRIGHT. New Haven: Tuttle, Morehouse & Taylor Co., 1904. Pp. 148.

This is an excellent piece of work, thorough in treatment and exhibiting a well-balanced judgment. It will be exceedingly useful to anyone desiring to make a careful study of the question. To begin at the end, there is in Appendix A a complete list of the ancient documents with summaries of their contents; in Appendix B, a list of the modern authorities with comments upon their attitude and value. Appendix C is a chart by which we can find in a moment all the references in the sources to any point—e. g., to the death losses in the battle. In the body of the work the attempt is made to arrive at the "pre-Periclean Vulgate" by rejecting or modifying all strongly anti-Lacedaemonian or pro-Athenian statements, which are to be traced, for the most part, to the influence upon Herodotus of the Athenian sentiment after 425 B. C.

One may cheerfully grant that the literary sources are strongly colored by Athenian prejudice. For instance, it is difficult to believe that the Lacedaemonians asked the Athenians to exchange positions because they were afraid to meet the Persians. Yet in a number of points I prefer to follow Herodotus more closely than Mr. Wright does. He would have us believe that every movement of the Greeks is a proof of the brilliant military genius of Pausanias. They occupied a strong position at Erythrae, but the second one was still stronger. The advantages gained by the Persians in the latter and the retreat to the island are part of the leader's plan to draw the enemy across the Asopus into unfavorable ground. Herodotus tells a different story. He says that the second position was upon low hills and level ground. The annoying attacks of the cavalry, the cutting-off of supplies in the Dryoscephalae Pass, the difficulty of securing water, and the withdrawal to the island are the perfectly natural results of a too exposed position. Wright does not include these statements of fact among the Periclean elements, but he interprets them in the manner indicated on the basis of the pre-Periclean